

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/563,234	EL-REFAEY, HAZEM
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Elli Peselev	1623

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 20 October 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 40-55.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.

/Elli Peselev/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1623

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant contends that the limitation to the amounts of azithromycin and misoprostol has been shown to have synergistic effect. This argument has not been found persuasive. The data presented in the specification is limited to the combination of 500 mg azithromycin and 200 mcg misoprostol. Said evidence is not commensurate with the full scope of the claimed invention.. Note, for example, that the present claims encompass administration 1000 milligrams of azithromycin and 50 milligrams of misoprostol. In said combination the proportion of amount of misoprostol to azithromycin administered is much lower than in the data presented. It cannot be ascertained from the data presented that such a combination will result in synergism. The declaration filed October 20, 2010 has been considered. The declaration states that the inventor believes that the synergistic effect is achieved throughout the claimed range. However, the declaration does not present any data to support said belief. Applicant further contends that the combination of azithromycin and misoprostol is not obvious over the cited prior art. This argument has not been found persuasive. Kelly specifically discloses vaginal administration of misoprostol (page 11, lines 24-26). Further, applicant admits on page 1 of the specification that "In the last decade misoprostol administered vaginally has become the prostaglandin of choice worldwide because of its stability at room temperature". The specification on page 1 also states that azithromycin is known for treating genital infections. Kirschner et al disclose in column 1, lines 29-35 that the vaginal cavity is subject to conditions which render it a target for disease and infections. The invention of Kirschner et al is directed to overcoming obstacles of delivering antibiotics, including azithromycin, vaginally. "It is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose...[T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art." In re Kerkhoven 626 F.2d 846, 850, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA). Further note that amount of prostaglandin administered is within the scope disclosed by Kelly on page 9...